DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 933 EA 020 420

AUTHOR	Tyree, Alexander K., Jr.
TITLE	Belonging and Work Control in Two Suburban Public High Schools and Their Effects on Teacher Engagement.
INSTITUTION	National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, Madison, WI.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Apr 88
GRANT	G-008690007
NOTE	43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; High Schools; Interprofessional Relationship; Interviews; *Professional Autonomy; *Secondary School Teachers; Sex Differences; *Socialization; Suburban Schools; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Morale; Teacher Motivation; Teacher Participation; *Teacher Response; Teaching (Occupation); Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS	*Teacher Engagement

ABSTRACT

This paper shows how, in two suburban high schools, Cherry Glen and Pinehill, teachers' work control interacted with normative and social integration in their effect upon teachers' engagement with their work. In each school, a two-person team initially observed, and later interviewed, eight teachers in English, math, foreign language, social studies, and science departments. The core sample of 16 teachers' interviews was supplemented by classroom observations, as well as additional short interviews with 10 other teachers or counselors at each school. After an initial review of the literature on teacher engagement, a brief account of the methodology, and contrasts between the school district communities and teachers, an extended discussion ensues of findings from each school. The first general topic is normative and social integration of teachers, which includes such topics as participation, curriculum adherence, teacher camaraderie, technical updating, content/skills focus, and professional engagement. The second topic is the teachers' work control, which includes control of instruction and control of intrinsic rewards of teaching. (In the section on Pinehill School, gender-related differences in teacher engagement and control are also extensively discussed.) The final part of each section discusses the relationship between normative and social integration, work control, and professional engagement. The findings of this paper do not support reform proposals that would call for using universal increases in either work control or social integration as levers to increase teachers' engagement in all schools. They do, however, support reforms that take into account the complexities of actual school relationships. A bibliography of 52 items is included. (TE)

ED301933

BELONGING AND WORK CONTROL IN TWO SUBURBAN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON TEACHER ENGAGEMENT

by

Alexander K. Tyree, Jr.*

Department of Educational Policy Studies and
National Center on Effective Secondary Schools
University of Wisconsin-Madison

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Tyree, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

*The research on which this paper is based was supported by the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools at the Wisconsin Center on Education Research which is supported by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement Grant # G-008690007. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the United States Department of Education.

The Principal Investigator for the project was Dr. Mary Haywood Metz, who also designed the interview guides, performed somewhat more than one-half of the interviews and gave assistance in the writing of this paper.

This paper was initially prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April, 1988.

EA 020 420

INTRODUCTION

The present teacher reform movement argues that more cohesive and purposive school staff contact, and greater control over school policy decisions will make teaching more attractive to persons who seek the level of engagement considered appropriate for "professionals." Such arrangements will facilitate the formation of and persistence of such engagement, reformers argue. The literature on alienation (for a review see Seeman, 1972, 1975) and work place alienation (e.g., Blauner, 1964) confirm this perspective.[1] It suggests that even among blue collar workers, normative integration , social integration and control over the work process are important to engagement or commitment and their opposites lead to alienation. Normative integration refers to shared staff expectations, reflected in formal and informal norms, regarding the nature and intensity of work; and social integration refers to staff inclusion in and solidarity with other staff or staff groups. This paper will show how, in two suburban high schools, teachers' work control interacted with normative and social integration in their effect upon teachers' engagement with their work. This paper suggests that simple "one size fits all" fixes for schools or teachers implied by at least some of the reform literature may not influence teacher engagement in expected ways. Unique school level work place integrative environments and work control structures influence the modal level and type of teacher engagement .

TEACHER ENGAGEMENT

Work engagement in complex organizations has been described as the result of workers' ability to find intrinsic meaning in work, to control their work, and to experience a sense of belonging in a work place community. Each of these elements may contribute separately or jointly or both to work engagement. Workers who are relatively more engaged might describe themselves as more immediately involved,

---

1 More recent work by Melvin Seeman suggests that alienation describes a relationship of people to their society, not just the work place. Seeman defines alienation as a complex of meaninglessness, normlessness, powerlessness, cultural estrangement, social estrangement and value isolation. Seeman's taxonomy, based largely on an examination of empirical findings, supports the general adequacy of Blauner's framework. Both Seeman and Blauner (more directly) trace the concept of alienation to Karl Marx's critique of capitalist laborrelations.

absorbed, interested, committed and as investing more of their private lives into their work; less engaged workers may describe themselves as distant, as working in a more mechanical way (Blauner, 1964).

Teaching engagement may be similar to general work engagement in some ways but not in others. Teaching may involve engagement in the *tasks connected with instruction*, and in the context of *a perceived teaching career*. Teachers' task engagements are partly the product of how teachers construe their classroom instruction goals. Annette Hemmings (1988) has identified three general types of instructional goals teachers espoused in the schools in our study: skills/content, values education and preparation for adult life. Lacey (1977), Woods (1983) and Nias (1981) have shown that teachers also construct a career engagement which frames their tasks and goals. Woods characterizes these as professional, vocational and continuance career commitments. Professionally committed teachers are characterized by a concern for the transmission of content and skills, and think of themselves as skilled and knowledgeable; they desire to keep these up. Vocationally committed teachers usually have a sense of personal mission, in a belief that they should care for students' personal or social needs, or that teaching is an expression of teachers' own identities. Continuance commitment is based on a calculative or instrumental orientation characterized by role adherence and low affect. Teachers thus committed remain in teaching because they have invested so much of themselves that they want to continue in, or do not feel that they can quit.

High school teachers' work control

Robert Blauner argued that work control consists of control of resources, work place policies, the pace, quantity, quality of work and the pressures exerted on workers. Who or what controls work in schools is not entirely clear. There is little direct supervision of teaching in most schools (Weick, 1976; Corwin, 1981; Firestone, 1985; Cusick, 1983). Also, most teachers also believe that they are autonomous in their classrooms (Sykes, 1984; Tye, 1985). Despite teacher perceptions, indirect controls on resources allocated to teachers (time, curriculum materials, and students) can significantly affect the amount of teaching and achievement in classrooms (Barr and Dreeben, 1983; Dreeben and Gamoran, 1986). The grouping of students into classes that are homogeneous or heterogeneous in ability and the assignment of individual teacher to specific groups, what are both usually administrative

prerogatives, have an especially heavy impact on teachers' control over their work (Hargreaves, 1967; Finley, 1984).

While increased pressures on the quantity, quality or pacing of industrial work seem to have alienative effects on workers, teachers may welcome some pressures on them or (more commonly) on their peers. The source of pressures and nature of pressures seems to matter to teachers. Administrative control of student disruptions, pressures for teacher accountability, efforts to increase teacher commitment, to raise teacher expectations for pupils, and clearly defined, regular teacher performance evaluations may be welcomed by teachers in high-achieving schools (Rosenholtz, 1985; Corcoran, 1985). By contrast, pressures on teachers from parents are usually less welcome (Connell, 1985; McPherson, 1972), and teachers generally rely on administrators to control these, that is, to "buffer" (Thompson, 1967) their teaching from unwanted parent interventions.

One aspect of teaching control critical to teacher engagement is their ability to extract intrinsic rewards by "reaching" students. In most schools, teachers' abilities to extract rewards are constrained by the "endemic uncertainties" of teaching. These uncertainties mostly arise from an uncertain teaching technology (Lortie, 1975; Dreeben, 1973), the obligation to reach diverse students in group learning situations, uncertain teacher-administrative jurisdictions (Dreeben, 1973), and minimal formal induction into the teaching situation (Lortie, 1975). Yet teachers often express their inability to control such rewards, especially in schools where students seem unable to master classroom learning (Webb and Ashton, 1986). Teachers' ability to acquire intrinsic rewards in high-achieving schools may be facilitated by their ability to minimize uncertainty through reliance on unambiguous, shared pedagogical, control and content expectations (Corcoran, 1985; Rosenholtz, 1985). I am aware of no studies which show that major changes in extrinsic rewards produce higher levels of engagement, though many studies argue that the lack of extrinsic rewards may cause teachers to consider leaving, while discouraging potential new recruits from entering teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1984).

School normative and social integration

According to Blauner, a major element which enhances work place engagement may be the sharing of norms among peers and across management and workers. However, norms can bring teachers or administrators or both together or isolate them from each other. In most schools, teacher-administrator norms of informal autonomy and non-interference often isolate teachers from their peers (Lortie, 1975; Dreeben, 1973; Weinshank, et. al., 1983; Tye, 1985; Sizer, 1985 (1984); Shanker, 1985). Furthermore, what brings teachers together may not necessarily be of much interest or benefit to the school or the students. If teachers all share common low expectations for low income or minority students, a school's staff may be normatively integrated with each other but not with their students (Hammersley, 1984; Metz, 1986). By contrast, in schools where normative integration takes the form of a shared high level of shared understanding of the goals of instruction, the methods of teaching and a belief that students are capable, teachers feel more engaged (Little, 1982; Rosenholtz, 1985; Corcoran, 1985). In summary, the content as well as the extent of normative integration may influence teacher engagement. The two schools discussed in paper vary both in the level and the type of normative integration, and consequently also of teachers' engagement.

Social integration describes a network of social relations which give workers a high expectancy for inclusion and social acceptance (Seeman, 1972, 1975) among peers and between workers and management (Blauner, 1964). Social and normative integration are related but separate aspects of school togetherness. Each is expected to enhance engagement.

Previous research has not separated social and normative integration. Instead, recent authors suggest, school teaching can provide either social isolation, inclining teachers to disengagement, or social integration, inclining teachers to engagement. In isolating settings, teachers' social contacts are often characterized by: teachers believing they are solely responsible for student outcomes; teacher conversations about "war stories," social chatter or non-teaching interests, and informal associations based mainly on friendship (Rosenholtz, 1985). Interacting secondary school settings, often associated with high-achieving schools, are more often characterized by collegial planning, task-related talk, risk-taking (Little, 1982) and intellectual sharing (Corcoran, 1985). Interacting settings may have

particular advantages over isolating settings in their potential enhancement of engagement. Work place collegiality, or the sharing of ideas, experience (or, more rarely, authority and influence) among teachers, as opposed to individual teacher autonomy, is argued to be critical to teachers' sense of efficacy (Webb and Ashton, 1986; Corcoran, 1985; Little, 1982) and engagement (Powell, et. al., 1985).

Work control, normative and social integration may all interact with each other and with contextual conditions of the work place. Norms may provide the basis for the kind of social contact and work control that predominates in a school. Teachers who feel that they can control the teaching environment may be more likely to share their teaching experience with other teachers. Where all teachers feel insecure about their ability to teach effectively, they are likely to maintain isolation from one another. Teachers who share their inability to control behavioral problems or academic failure in such a setting may lose status with their peers (Rosenholtz, 1985). Teachers who feel that they have reached individual teaching solutions which bring them intrinsic rewards or allow them to maintain their extrinsic rewards may also be reluctant to discuss alternate teaching arrangements with peers (Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1985; Sykes, 1984). In short, autonomy in the classroom may be won at the expense of collegial, and task-related social relations (Sykes, 1984). In the two schools reported here, this finding seems highly relevant. Neither autonomy nor integration alone explain the levels or kinds of engagement prevalent in the two schools.

THE SAMPLE FOR THIS PAPER

This article is based on teacher interviews and selected observations in two American public high schools, a sub-sample of a larger sample of teachers drawn from eight schools. In each school a two-person team, of which I was one member, initially observed eight teachers in English, Math, Foreign Language, Social Studies or Science departments. The team interviewed these teachers during or after school or both. The core sample of sixteen teachers' interviews was supplemented by research staff classroom observations, as well as additional short interviews with ten other teachers and/or counselors at each school. This paper also is informed by a coordinated study of administrators conducted by a different team.

Most of the sixteen core teachers had more than seven years teaching experience; some had over thirty years. All of the teachers had earned at least Bachelors degrees, generally a subject-specific degree in Education. Our core sample for the two schools included eleven males and five females. Many of the males we chose were married, while many of the females were not. There were no minority teachers in the sub-sample.

CONTRASTS BETWEEN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT COMMUNITIES AND TEACHERS

There are many contrasts and few similarities in the communities in which the two high schools were located. Cherry Glen and Pinehill were predominantly white suburbs of The City and both contained largely homogeneous social settings. But Cherry Glen contained a largely white collar population, while Pinehill contained predominantly blue collar groups. While Cherry Glen's property tax base was growing, Pinehill's was shrinking. Around the high school at Cherry Glen, developers constructed high-priced new condominiums, new shopping centers, corporate and professional office space. Around Pinehill, factories closed their operations or parts of their operations, while other developers constructed new modestly-priced housing.

A 1985-1986 comparison of student standardized achievement tests in the two districts indicates Cherry Glen's standings of eighth grade math and reading were not a great deal higher than Pinehill's when compared to national test score norms. However, the drop-out rates in Pinehill were not only higher than Cherry Glen, but were increasing over the last three school years. While most of Cherry Glen's children attended four year colleges after graduation, most of Pinehill's children went on to blue collar jobs, or technical schools.

While most of the Cherry Glen teaching staff lived outside the school district (most said they could not afford to live in the district), those at Pinehill lived in Pinehill or in similar blue collar communities (in which most of them had grown up as well). Most of the Pinehill teachers came from blue collar families or farm backgrounds, while several at Cherry Glen grew up in white collar families. Teachers in both districts shared similar formal educational backgrounds. The percentage of Bachelors and Masters

degrees was roughly equivalent across both districts, with only 2% more of total Cherry Glen teachers completing Masters degrees.

The relations between teachers as a group and their communities and administrations differed dramatically. While the Cherry Glen teachers association and school board shared a history of collaboration, the Pinehill association and school board shared a history of conflict. While contract negotiations at Cherry Glen often resulted in quiet agreements (despite one occasion when the union sponsored working to the rule), those at Pinehill had been marked by a strike, and at least one additional occasion when the union encouraged teachers to work to the rule. While the Cherry Glen association collaborated with the administration to develop a peer evaluation system, the Pinehill association had been trying to stop the district administration from using procedures they argued amounted to harassment. In short, the Pinehill teachers association had acted like and had been treated like a blue collar labor union, while the Cherry Hill teachers' association had acted like and was treated like a white collar professional organization.

CHERRY GLEN

Normative and Social Integration at Cherry Glen

> I: Does anybody besides the students know much about what you do in a classroom?
> T: Oh, I think, I think my colleagues do. The people that I work with most closely, and I think there is a certain ...knowledge, if you want to call it, among a school community ...as to who is doing what. Being aware of what's going on elsewhere. So I think that perhaps others are aware.

Most teachers at Cherry Glen shared a high degree of work-related normative integration with the administration and other teachers at the school level and with each other at the department level. A major source of normative and social integration was the direction of the principal, Mr. Coyne. Mr. Coyne carefully orchestrated formal participation in school-improvement committees, extracurricular activities, non-teaching supervision activities, and the formal departmental curriculum committees. Indirectly, Mr. Coyne and the district administration maximized teachers' participation in their departments, through requiring curriculum-focused collaborative departmental meetings. This increased the level of common departmental expectations that particular content would be covered and that methods which maximized

content coverage were preferable to other methods. Across the administrative and teaching staff there was a shared normative understanding that teaching demanded participation in activities within and beyond the classroom, that minor updates in teaching methods were necessary, and that academic content and skill teaching (responsive to the nature of the students) were central and legitimate goals for all teachers. The norms of participation, the obligation to follow the curriculum, the obligation to update knowledge and skills and the expectation that teaching consisted of content/skills instruction were supported by the principal and informally by teachers.

Participation

> The participation norm included the obligation to participate in extracurricular activities:
>
> It's kind of an unwritten expectation.... There are a lot of teachers that don't do any coaching but then they are expected to help at different events like maybe take tickets at football games or to be on crowd control.

Mr. Coyne engineered this participation through his annual request that teachers submit their preferences for particular extra-curricular activity. Teachers were not asked to participate but rather were asked what they wanted to participate in. Those not directing activities were assigned to help supervise, collect ticket money or provide related services.

Another aspect of the school's participative normative structures was teachers' obligation to participate with peers in school improvement. The principal's system generated faculty concerns from required "randomly" selected staff group meetings about the school. Then he formed ad hoc committees to suggest and develop school improvement projects. According to most of the teachers, committee recommendations and suggestions were then either approved by the administration or changed to conform to administrative goals or designs. From the interviews, it is unclear whether the principal or the central office or both were responsible for this pattern.

Curriculum adherence

At Cherry Glen, this meant the obligation faithfully to teach the curriculum, as developed by the department. Teachers were consistently evaluated annually. Administrators looked for a fit between the formal curriculum and what the teacher was actually teaching; though apparently there was less scrutiny of this "fit" with high seniority teachers. In addition, staff members expected each other to follow the curriculum. In most departments, teachers expressed the importance of being able to count on other teachers having taught certain content or skills, so that students could handle later courses. In addition, the staff shared expectations that they would use their preparation periods in service of classroom or extracurricular preparation. Preparation outside of school was expected of most teachers, and most spent time outside of the required school day preparing tests, quizzes, grading or planning activities.

Technical updating

Technical updating was another norm shared by the majority of teachers at Cherry Glen. By this, teachers meant that it was important to seek out and try new methods to gain student cooperation, report results better, and teach content better. During the time we investigated Cherry Glen, several technical updates were in progress; they included but were not limited to: student motivation systems, computerization of school operations and the application of computer programs to subject teaching, and a new system of teacher evaluation. In other words, teachers shared, usually in small, sometimes departmental, groups a willingness to initiate technical innovations.

Content/skills focus

Teachers expected that they and their peers would concentrate on the teaching of academic content and skills, usually translated as the obligation to cover the required content. At the same time, teachers were expected to work at ways in which to enlist student participation in that kind of learning. Teachers who were part of a group transferred from the junior high school with the ninth grade, four years before the study, noted that high school teachers seemed more "content" than "kid"-oriented. Two of the former junior high school teachers spoke of changing their practices to conform to this staff expectation, one to

keep up with colleagues' content coverage expectations. Several teachers noted that one of the few ways to get into trouble at the school was to depart from the curriculum. However, most teachers rejected content orientations which treated students as mere receptacles for teacher knowledge. Many teachers spoke of various clever ways by which to enlist student support and interest in the learning of content and skills.

"Professional" engagement

The formal and informal sharing of pedagogical techniques and content directly supported teachers' "professional" engagement with their work. The administration required regular departmental updating of curriculum, though teachers were allowed to decide what texts to use, what units to include and to what extent unit and lesson content would be controlled by the department or by the teacher. Departments met regularly, and departmental teachers were located in proximity to each other. In the school, most staff tended to associate with other department members. This sharing also indirectly exerted a control on what was taught and how it would be taught in various departments. School and departmental norms supporting the teaching of academic content and skills through recently developed methods allowed teachers to share knowledge and techniques with other department members. This helped them to define standards by which students should or would be evaluated. This clarity in the task and acceptance of limited, relatively clear, measures of success effectively reduced some of the "endemic uncertainties" associated with teaching. However, this system tended to standardize what was taught, how fast it would be taught, and what methods would be used.

Some department members, stressed the clarifying and collegial aspects of departmental sharing, while others, referred more often to standardization of content, grading or methods. For example, a humanities teacher referred to collegiality in and out of department meetings:

> Well, we do plan to do this at our meetings, occasionally. We ask that they bring along samples and everything. That's very planned ...but most of the rest of it is just the great respect we feel for one another, that we're, we're, we're genuinely interested in what the other person is doing, and we'll ask him, well, "Where are you now in the subject? Are you doing anything different for a model ____?", we're just always, always interested. So, you know, that's to a certain extent ...spontaneous, but it's something you do as almost a natural reflex. You're always checking out, and, and sometimes it's just a natural place to

> go for a resource. You think, "Gosh, I need a good quiz on that part of the unit. I wonder whether so and so would give me one."

In a non-humanities subject area, sharing was different, the purpose being mainly the coordination of effort and homogenization of content, grading and methods.

> You find out that what you're doing is what the other person is doing. You find out you're on the right track. You basically are covering the same material at the same time and with the same sort of tests. And you find out that you're not, quote, too easy, too hard.

At Cherry Glen teacher engagement with the school and their school teaching was considerable, especially among those originally recruited to the school. Most teachers reported and exhibited substantial time within and outside the school day. Engagement was enhanced by earlier district recruitment practices, and the respect teachers held for each others' knowledge and teaching abilities.

Recruitment-especially in the early years of the school-of staff members interested in and capable of competent content/skills instruction contributed to the school-wide "professional" engagement. Several of the original staff members who came to Cherry Glen did so by hearing about the school's reputation for academic excellence, or the school's having requested their joining the staff. Teachers expressed pride in either having been recruited or being one of the select teachers who were good enough to teach at Cherry Glen. Declining enrollment and a dramatic influx of junior high school teachers transferred with the ninth grade had changed the recruiting system which the district had used to develop a staff of highly competent and motivated teachers. Most transferees were asked to choose which of the two high schools they would like to join, and most referred to this choice as one with which they were happy. A recent transferee commented about other teachers in the school:

> I have to really respect them and admire them. I definitely think that has an effect on, on what I do, because I want to try to do as good a job as they're doing. I'm maybe not able to, but I do have that sort of respect, and I, I do look up to people. Even though I've taught twenty-two years, I think that there are people here that deserve that kind of respect.

Summary: Integration at Cherry Glen

For teachers at Cherry Glen, shared norms of participation and common foci on technical educational goals reinforced teachers' sense of belonging and acceptance with the staff as a whole and departments in particular. The principal sponsored and engineered participation norms, and indirectly

stimulated coordinated and common orientations among departments. The administration enhanced a sense of specialness with its early recruitment policies; it tried to integrate new transferees into the school's operating mode. Most departments further enhanced teachers' sense of social and normative integration by the sharing of philosophies and teaching standards. Normative and social integration contributed to teachers "professionally" sharing of knowledge and skills.

Integration, as described above, is described primarily on the basis of interview analysis. When teachers spoke, they sounded like the "professional" teachers Peter Woods describes. However, the consistencies in rhetoric often contrasted with variety in performance. Some teachers worked extremely hard to engage students in relatively rigorous thinking activities, while others relied heavily on standard recitation and limited scope questions, while most students remained passive participants most of the hour. One of the teachers who sounded highly engaged in the interview taught in a friendly manner but did not seem to require very much of students. Also, the reader should not assume that because teachers at Cherry Glen focused mainly on content and skills instruction that all students at this school were required to demonstrate high levels of content knowledge or skill competencies. This varied across teachers, courses and ability levels of the same course.

Integrative task-related sharing characteristic of this school did contribute to greater certainty among teachers on curriculum, methods and activities. Integration was also a tool of standardization, most teachers recognizing that failure to conform with departmental content, grading, or methods expectations would bring peer disapproval and possibly unwanted administrative attention.

> You might deviate from a course outline. But that should not be a matter of habit, he should not be ignoring the curriculum guide we are obligated by contract to follow.... In our individual contract there is a paragraph that alludes to ...carrying out the duty or the assignment given. So, if I'm assigned to teach say an algebra class, the applied, the implication is that I will teach it as its described by this district.

Integration made a difference to the way teachers felt about their work, and to a lesser extent how they went about their work. A professional kind of engagement was expected and most teachers, through skills and content orientations and maintenance of school participation, maintained images that looked like

professional orientations to teaching. Integration provided both control over uncertainty and constraint on variable approaches to teaching.

Work Control at Cherry Glen

As other school research has discovered, much of the administrative control of teaching work at Cherry Glen was so taken for granted as not to be perceived as control by teachers. The administration completely controlled the formal allocation of time and money, and the sorting of students into classes. School policies lay beyond teachers' effective control. The engineering of policy consent through school improvement committees appeared to involve teachers in policy-making, though most teachers regarded many of the policy committees as administrative justifications for pre-decided policies. Teachers' involvement with policy making was one of the most disengaging aspects of the school. Despite the good intentions behind administrative desires to teacher policy involvement, the effects of overturning teacher recommendations caused teachers to want to distance themselves from policy committees and policy committee decisions.

> Yeah, they make the final decision. They ... tally the votes, you know. So they, they decide what, what our opinions were.

Teachers appreciated administrative control which buffered teachers from parent influences and which controlled problem student and teacher behaviors. The school administration buffered the teachers' curriculum and its implementation from most interference from powerful parent pressures. For this buffering to be effective, teachers had to follow the department curriculum, keep up with the variety of paper work required to justify grading (forms explaining how you grade students, forms reporting student progress or lack thereof), and the curriculum-in-use (copies of your weekly lesson plans), and meet administrative expectations for extra-classroom participation.

In teachers' discussions, extensive administrative paperwork requirements were a fair exchange for protection from unwanted parental interventions or necessary evils attending what at least some teachers regarded as good organizational practices by the administration.

> We complain a lot but I know many people who have taught elsewhere. Such as a simple thing as having a curriculum guide, that's something [Mr. Coyne] developed here in all departments. For a new teacher those were valuable. I can remember again going to [another high school in the area] and being told "Here's the book; teach it." "Yeah but when, how, what, what will I take from here?" "I don't know just do it." I'm sure there are still schools that operate that way.

Administrative delegation of some curriculum authority to teachers seemed to enhance teachers overall sense of work control. Even though time and student allocations lay beyond teachers' control, they could have an impact on curriculum materials through their department committees. Teachers regarded this control as significant. In departmental committees, teachers could decide the scope and sequence, texts to be used, the objectives of their departments, and the courses within departments. The school board and the administration supported this departmental curricular authority.

> I think if you're dealing with curriculum, yes. [The administration and the school board] are very good about implementing what we want and doing it the way we feel because we are after all the ones who are doing it.

Most teachers found district-supplied curriculum materials adequate.

> I think we're, we're reasonably well supplied. There are, we don't get absolutely everything we want.... Like anything else, if our budget, for all of our department exceeds what the school has been allocated, then we have to pare it down.... We get together as a department and say, 'While we're willing to forego this, I don't want that to be cut out', and so on.

Within some departments, teachers felt that they could call on other teachers for curriculum materials, and teaching ideas. Particularly in some departments, this kind of sharing extended teaching resources which were completely controlled by the teachers themselves.

> We share lesson plans, we share experiences all the time. So our, the department knows very well what's going on in other people's classes ...because we talk to one another. I mean it, we even spend part of our department meetings sharing things that we think other people would like to know about.

Control of Instruction

Teachers were not free to teach anything they pleased to anyone they pleased. The school's central mission was the transmission of academic knowledge and skills, and the emphasis on these had been increasing recently, in response to national, state and parental pressures. Teachers or departments who were not conforming with these expectations could expect difficulty. There were many factors outside

teachers' control that shaped who and what they would teach. These included fluctuations due to increased academic requirements; the in-school expectations of content/skills orientations; expectations that departmental curriculum would be followed; course sequencing within departments; the stratification of students by ability into required courses ; the process of deciding who would teach what; the state requirements for certification, the number of certifications the individual possessed and that possessed by other individuals in the department; and the seniority and influence of particular individuals. Most of these factors matched teachers and students to available classes, in effect leaving teachers with narrow decision-making associated with teaching a particular class populated by particular kinds of students.

A few of those factors, like declining enrollment in the district, de-stabilized teaching expectations. Some individual teachers controlled the classes to which they were assigned through their use of seniority. Once senior teachers developed incumbency in upper level courses, they often remained teaching them as long as they chose to do so. Some form of incumbency for senior staff members seemed to be a dominant factor in scheduling in most departments. Some of the more senior members of departments could control unpredictable events (induced by scheduling complexities and fluctuations) by dropping certifications. By doing so, teachers could limit their teaching to one course, usually a required course that would be less subject to major enrollment fluctuations. This practice appeared to be a seniority privilege tolerated within departments and by the administration. While stabilizing the position of senior teachers, this practice also de-stabilized the control of younger teachers. Therefore, when senior department members reduced their certifications to subjects they preferred, junior members with multiple certifications often had to increase the number of their classroom preparations or quit teaching at the school.

Most external controls on teaching, however , seemed to stabilize teachers' notions of teaching, learning and students' abilities. They contributed to teachers ability to size up their students, match students to content and skills learning methods and evaluate student performance with relative confidence. Most teachers tended to classify students, curriculum and methods on the basis of experience with past groups of students.

> The average student tends to take American literature, the lower than average takes drama, that's just a common course that's not too difficult, and the brighter students take British and world literature.... Students who take advanced composition ...think that they're going on to school. Now, we have an intermediate comp for those kids who feel uncomfortable in writing at this stage, but would like to take advanced comp later on. And then we have an applied English, for those who think that they are not going on at all.

Direct teacher control over lessons came in the kinds of activities teachers chose, the choices they allowed their students, the order and frequency with which they chose particular activities, and the amount of material the covered. Predicting what would work with particular groups of students allowed teachers to control their classroom planning, and set the frequency and difficulty of student testing to maximize students' academic success.

This sense of control they experienced was reflected in their discussion of the process of teaching. The teacher in the first quotation discussed how the department taught research paper writing.

> Now what we're doing ...is have kids list everything under the sun that they are interested in, and we sit down in this advanced comp, and we pick out those subject areas where there could be a good research paper written, and let the kid choose from those subjects where he has a felt need to know something.

> With the advanced class I have a plan. Each day I'm able to pursue it ...without too many hang-ups and problems. And it also happens to be a group of students I worked with pretty closely last year.... Whereas I guess in the other classes, the first quarter of the year, you go through a feeling-out process. And it seems like as the year goes on, you learn what you can do, and what you can't do.

Control of rewards

Teachers' ability to predict and control the intrinsic rewards of teaching is a major part of their ability to control their work and a critical part of their continuing engagement with their work (Lortie, 1975, Kottcamp, et. al., 1986). Most teachers at Cherry Glen seemed to find intrinsic rewards readily available in their daily work, and many felt almost single-handedly responsible for those rewards. The sources of teaching rewards were unique, but all reflected a sense that teachers had reached students in some concrete way. Some teachers obtained rewards from the success of classroom learning experiences.

> I: What was the best thing that happened last week?
> T: Last week would have to be the successes of students on a test, or, or a quiz situation. I put my heart and soul in that, and when they do well, you know, I'm happy, I'm pleased.

> In the business world, if a person was motivated, he or she was always rewarded with monetary things, or with promotions, and ...we obviously do not have the same structure. You know, I think you have to reap your satisfaction as a teacher from doing other things, you know, from, from knowing that the lesson was well taught, from, just from very little, little strokes.

Two teachers felt successful with the students this year but expressed how much difference a particular group of students could make to their sense of accomplishment:

> when I taught the class to freshmen, sometimes I felt like I was beating my head against the wall, because a lot of kids didn't want to learn. But this year with kids I've got, it makes it so easy, and you move along so fast, because they do have a very broad knowledge of the subject, I think.

> ...because it's the nature of the class and the student that you get.... In fifth hour you know you can toss a coin sometimes what's going to be successful for you, so it really depends on the kids that you get.

Another discussed how his engagement with teaching was related to his collegial contacts, especially within his department.

> I like the fact that I feel good about being a teacher because I think most teachers are pretty well-informed people.... Most of the people that I work with have at least Masters' degrees, and I see they're real conscientious. I see them here in the morning when I come, and many times people are here after I leave.

While intrinsic rewards like collegial contact and the successful "reaching" of students were normally available to most Cherry Glen teachers, many were also troubled by their lack of status, the lack of remuneration in teaching and the lack of information that their services were valued by society.

> I think that in the last ten years or so, I have said to myself, I don't know who this little man is inside of me that keeps telling me to say this to myself, "You're worth a lot of money, and you've never gotten it, and you're going to retire poor, and that's not fair." Now, there's somebody inside of me who's not been happy about this, in spite of the fact that, you know, I love teaching and I appreciate what kinds of rewards there are, there's somebody inside me who's very resentful.

Despite such resentments, most teachers had no immediate plans to leave teaching, no immediate plans to change their level of involvement, commitment or expenditure of energy. The things that gave them some of their most precious and predictable rewards-their success with students and their collegial relations with peers-did not prevent them from wondering if teaching was all they should or could do.

Normative and Social Integration, Work Control and Engagement: Professional Careers at Cherry Glen

Despite the numerous mostly indirect controls on their teaching, most Cherry Glen teachers felt they had the ability and opportunity to control their teaching work, particularly the intrinsic rewards of the work. Norms of continuous technical improvement and participation and belonging through task-related associations reinforced each other and teachers' sense of work control to produce high levels of involvement, commitment and absorption in the tasks of teaching. The norms which infused the social relations supported teacher group and individual commitments to content and skills teaching. While the principal formally engineered participation, involvement and commitment, the teachers engineered the curriculum in a sphere demarcated by the administration. The highly bounded world of the school provided uncertainty control, and encouraged a narrow but high range of "professional" engagement. Yet, the boundaries also limited the extent of individual creativity in ways that the other school discussed later in this paper did not.

Apart from questions of who controlled resources, at this school resources for teaching were available and most teachers had found ways in which to produce successful processes and outcomes with students of varying abilities. The resources of time, materials and students were either adequate or generous, according to most teachers. Stability in student and teacher assignments allowed teachers to use activities which had worked in the past, refining the details of execution. Subject departments, through administrative delegation, became mechanisms for indirect teacher group curriculum influence and control. Teachers participated willingly in curriculum work, despite the extra time involved and their loss of some individual autonomy vis-à-vis their peers. Once departments formed the standards and ordered the materials, their teachers generally followed them. Following the curriculum, teachers protected themselves from parent interventions, and gained a sense of legitimacy, confidence and control in overcoming some of the endemic uncertainties which accompanies most school teaching. Not all uncertainty was dispatched, and teachers' sense of control was not complete, but it was substantial.

Despite individual teachers' lack of control in some areas, most teachers did not express powerlessness about these built-in constraints of the work place. Part of the reason might have been that

most of what was beyond the control of teachers was working so well it seemed invisible. Part of the reason for this might also have been that larger school normative patterns, focused through and enhanced by work-focused departmental relationships and norms, gave teachers a sense of belonging to a community which made objective constraints seem insignificant to teachers. Perhaps, having internalized the norms upon which the school was based, teachers were not aware of the large number of controls on the framing of their work.

In general, teachers at Cherry Glen seemed highly absorbed and involved in the subject/skills teaching which formed the substance of a form of "professional" teaching engagement. Teachers in most of the departments we had contact with seemed to have built networks of technical assistance, and support which they regarded as enhancements to their teaching performance. The absorption in work continued to their preparation during and outside the school day.

I: Does anyone beside the students know what you do in the classroom?
T: No.
I: No?
T: [Teacher discusses how he was evaluated this year by an assistant principal who was a former student of his] ....Other than that, I guess after teaching here for twenty-five years, maybe they respect me as a teacher. I don't know. I hope they do, but ...there are years go by that nobody ever comes in.

Normative and Social Integration at Pinehill

Like teachers at Cherry Glen, Pinehill teachers felt that they belonged to a school community, but the Pinehill community was less administratively engineered and looser than Cherry Glen. At Pinehill, the lack of strong administratively orchestrated integrative pressures had at least two observable effects. First, the Pinehill staff exhibited much greater variety in their engagement orientations than their counterparts at Cherry Glen. Second, the absence of an active role for departments allowed teachers' attachments to non-department and non-school groups, some of which co-existed with the school. Third, some of these groups supported moderate engagement, while others supported lower engagement, levels.

The staff community was loosely unified by normative integration around "camaraderie," the toleration of idiosyncrasy and acceptance of administrative proscriptions regarding order and student failures. The administration encouraged these norms; the principal was a major influence on the maintenance of the general integrative tone. Camaraderie, idiosyncrasy and minimal proscriptions at Pinehill encouraged little of the departmental technical sharing, curriculum conformity and homogeneity of engagement orientation so prevalent at Cherry Glen. Cherry Glen's school-wide norms encouraged a school-wide "professional" orientation. However, at Pinehill women's group norms supported mainly vocational orientations to teaching (expression of one's true identity, or as a mission to care for students' needs), while men supported continuance engagement orientations (minimal affect role adherence with instrumental dimensions).

Camaraderie and common experience

Pinehill teachers described camaraderie as the general good feeling teachers associated with being with each other in school, their belief that teachers were willing to help each other out when necessary, and the familiarity that comes from years of association with each other.

> I, I feel really quite comfortable about the general camaraderie, the general person to person support. Granted, more between some people than others, but I think there's a general positive feeling about each other.

> I think we've all been together so long that everybody knows what everybody else is like and you can talk about anything around here and often times people do.

Teachers contributed to camaraderie through their active and passive participation in the annual Christmas party. The annual Christmas party (held in early spring due to the importance of maximizing participation) was a major school-wide social event for teachers. Considerable advance planning, meetings and individual efforts went into making the party successful. Most teachers regarded the event as a renewal of the general acceptance teachers afforded each other. Camaraderie implied a flat acceptance in the community regardless of one's teaching subject, and one's ability or desire to teach.

The principal, Mr. Taylor, was an active force in the maintenance of camaraderie. He had grown up in neighboring Millerton with many of the senior teachers. He maintained personal contacts outside school with many of them. However, Mr. Taylor did more than maintain old friendships. He often circulated through the halls, classrooms and department meetings, greeting students and teachers, showing genuine interest in what they were doing. He also praised and thanked teachers for doing special activities with students. Furthermore, Mr. Taylor often worked to find the means for teachers to begin new courses, and special projects for students. In these ways, Mr. Taylor established personal commitments with individual teachers, helped individual teachers to remain involved and established trust with many teachers, and thus positively influenced their engagement. Teachers tended to identify with Mr. Taylor as one of them, someone who understood teachers' lives, who was accessible and willing to help them out where he could.

Idiosyncrasy

Idiosyncrasy among staff members at Pinehill, closely related to camaraderie, was tolerated on the school and departmental level to a degree the Cherry Glen staff probably would never have allowed. Usually, idiosyncrasy took the form of the administration allowing teachers to have broad de facto discretion over what they taught and how they taught it. None of the administrative personnel seemed willing to intervene in cases where it became obvious that teachers were disregarding the department curriculum. The administration also tolerated idiosyncratic practices through their infrequent formal evaluation. Teachers tolerated idiosyncrasy within their departments by ignoring widely divergent practices and failing to sanction departures from the formal curriculum. Idiosyncrasy had historical dimensions, in that most of the teachers interviewed entered their teaching jobs at this school with little more guidance than an existing textbook and a classroom in which to teach. The early socialization of new recruits contributed to individualized approaches to teaching. Over time, teachers and small groups of teachers had developed their own approaches to curriculum and instruction.

Idiosyncrasy had two obvious effects on engagement. First, it undercut the security Cherry Glen teachers experienced through the establishment of common educational standards by which teachers could measure their success relative to other teachers in teaching content and skills to students. Second, idiosyncrasy allowed scope for innovation while the Cherry Glen curriculum constrained innovation through its insistence on departmental consensus.

The twin proscriptions

Most Pinehill teachers did not see any "educational" direction in which the school was heading. The following was a typical response to a question on the topic:

> I don't really think so. I really don't.... There isn't. I don't know that the school has a general direction, other than, you know, general education, like any other school.

However, indirectly teacher behavior was directed and bounded by the twin teacher obligations of not sending too many students to the office and not failing too many students. At Cherry Glen, the reader will recall, not following the curriculum could get teachers into trouble. At Pinehill, violating either of the

twin proscriptions against excessive dismissal or excessive failing grades could get a teacher into trouble with parents, trouble with administrators, tiring peer disapproval or all three.

> Flunking a lot of kids gets some people into difficulties. I mean, flunking large numbers of kids...I would guess that the other thing that would get a teacher into trouble is having discipline problems, not being able to handle your own classroom discipline situations constantly.

According to many teachers, the twin proscriptions probably satisfied community expectations, by maximizing course passage at the expense of "education."

> Cause if it [the school] was run the way we [administrators and teachers] wanted it to be, the school would probably have three or four hundred less kids, and there'd be much more education going on.

On the school level, norms of camaraderie, the two proscriptions and acceptance of idiosyncrasy loosely linked teachers to each other and to the administration. Camaraderie and acceptance of idiosyncrasy allowed personal loyalties and personal (sometimes innovative) and gender-related approaches to teaching, while posing obstacles to common approaches to curriculum and pedagogy. The toleration of idiosyncrasy, the twin proscriptions, and camaraderie reinforced each other. Overall, teachers said that they were doing what they thought the community would allow, and what would keep them in good standing with the administration and, to a lesser extent, their peers.

Gender group social integration and teaching norms

While the school provided a set of general norms which connected teachers loosely to the school, gender groups and gender relationships inside and outside of school influenced the amount and nature of teacher engagement as well as teachers' instructional goals. Informal gender relations influenced teachers' conversations, teachers' associations, and the instructional goals and, to a lesser extent, practices most favored. The teachers lounge, during the lunch hours, was the most obvious place to observe the separate physical and social worlds of men and women teachers. Interviews further reflected separate social support systems available to teachers of both sexes.

Men's model relations, norms and career engagement

In the lounge during lunch, men all sat at smaller tables to one side of the lounge, most playing card games. Some men played cards during their preparation periods. While playing cards, men did not usually talk about students, curriculum or school in general.

> [One female noted] It is rare to find men talking about students. You listen to the men down there. They talk sports, usually they talk sports. The men in the faculty room don't do it. I will talk with some of the men about educational things, but you get them together and that is not a subject they want to discuss.

According to one teacher, card playing linked men to after-school primarily male social contacts which also promoted non-school related social activities and conversations.

> And I socialize with a group outside of school. You know there's a group of us here that fish and hunt with a couple of guys, and play golf with a bunch...Guys will stop, and some of the gals will stop by and bowl on the Tuesday nights with the teachers' bowling league, so you know I, once, twice a month we bowl.

Even outside of lounge card-playing circles, many men considered in-school discussion of teaching in the presence of other men undesirable. One man was asked about whether he would like to or would find it helpful to discuss curriculum, treatment of students or methods with other apparently male teachers.

> Oh, I think that at least there is some talking shop, but I think most people are glad to get away from shop talk, and ...get talking about [the local professional basketball team, or the football team] ...you know, going fishing, or things other than teaching.

Discussion of teaching outside school was definitely considered inappropriate for men. One man remarked that "I've never taken my briefcase home to the family." Essentially, men's gender groups remained intact in and out of school, colonizing the school's space and time with non-teaching discussion.

Men's outside time commitment to teaching was minimal compared to most of the women and most of the Cherry Glen teachers. Most of the men put in little or no time outside of school hours. One of the

men said he worked between fifteen and twenty hours extra in a typical week, outdistancing his nearest male competitor by 15 hours.

Most men spoke of their teaching career in terms of continuance, though one man expressed elements of a professional outlook and another expressed orientations toward professional, vocational and continuance engagements. Many males viewed their career in teaching in terms of investments and sacrifices that had committed them to continuing in teaching, and a calculation of costs and benefits, in which the benefits slightly outweighed the costs. Their sacrifices had become irretrievable personal investments, or what Becker (1960) would call "side bets." Most of the senior men referred to having to have taken second jobs in the summer and some during the school year to make ends meet, or save for their children's educations. Some referred to the sacrifice they made in terms of social status.

> All-in-all, I guess I'm trapped. I probably like mostly what I'm doing. I don't know what, if I'll be able to take it, when I finally decide to retire. I'm going to, I'll have to work hard to find ways to fill my day.... The lack of esteem that people have for me.... Yeah. I have thought of leaving teaching ...partly because of the financial reasons, and again, the esteem issue, that I would like to show people that I can do all those things that they do.

Among many males, there was a sense that they had reached what they believed was a comfort level associated with their sense of competence in handling the demands of teaching. The comfort level entailed a low involvement, and a familiarity or sense of competence one might get from doing the same thing over a long period of time.

> I'm not talking about doing handsprings and cartwheels and "yeah, I really enjoy this," but enough where you can get up every morning and go to work and not worry about taking high blood pressure pills or you know.... I can't take this any longer." Well, I, that's how I perceive myself. I can do this job.

Thus, most men referred to continuing to teach, despite their self-acknowledged lack of involvement and interest in classroom teaching. Several hoped that they would be able to retire soon.

> No, no, you're not going to have to kick me out when it comes to retirement, because I frankly think that I'm going to retire as early as I can, simply because I think I am experiencing, not classic teacher burnout, but I don't know that I'm as effective as I used to be. I don't know that I've got the energy that I once had. But when I see it's time that I can afford to leave, I'm going to retire, so I can very well retire at fifty-eight.

Men's relations not only supported modal continuance career orientations but also instructional goals which combined an inculcation of values and a preparation for adulthood. Many men tried to inculcate

in students' behaviors which would carry over to "real life" situations. Obedience to superiors, persistance in the face of difficulty, completion of work, promptness, attendance, and some form of paying attention to others were important to most of the men teachers. Content and skills teaching were considered important additions to lessons for the upper ability students. Many men depreciated and some openly questioned, the value of content and skills instruction for average and below average students, and doubted that absorption in classroom teaching would make much difference to students. In doing so, some expressed resistance toward a professional orientation associated with content/skills instruction.

> Attitudes. Forget about content, because they're going to forget about it fifteen minutes after June 10th, they're going to forget ninety percent of it anyway.... I think I'm trying to teach them how to be better people within, within a group. How to get along with other people.

> I'm not terribly convinced that subject matter is all what it's cracked up to be. That, because, you know, my lesson today on, I think went relatively well, ...but I don't know that five years from now, anybody's going to remember what I taught them ...today. But if they show some interest today in [the subject of the lesson] and carry through a little bit with it, they maybe start to vote a little bit as a result of what I've said, and then I can, and then I think I've accomplished what I've, you know, what I want.

Since teachers had to meet the demands of the twin prescriptions, teachers had to find ways to entice students to cooperate with instruction without actually holding the most reluctant responsible (in terms of evaluation and grading) for subject or skill competence. Systems usually relied on attendance and tardiness formulas with strong emphasis on student completion of assignments in or out of class. Two of the men openly contracted with students: they guaranteed passing grades in return for good student behavior. Some of the teachers and most of the men teachers rewarded students with socializing time at the end of every period if the class had remained on task. One of the three males most integrated into the male group tried to insure high pass rates and high levels of cooperation by rarely expecting students to read, write or remember the content in his lower-ability classes.

Two of the men teachers did not fit the above pattern tightly. One of the men teachers whom we interviewed and spent the day was not a lounge card player, and did not eat in the lounge. This teacher used grading systems like that in other men's classrooms, but he had a different feeling about his work. He showed enthusiasm for, even love of, his subject and he emphasized skill development. He also displayed a

desire to rescue alienated students from school failure. All of this was supported by sustenance he obtained from outside groups and persons. Despite his marginal attachment to the model gender norms and relations and his recognition that his ideas were quite different from those of other staff, this teacher managed to maintain a high level of involvement in his classroom instruction. One other man, who had created his own courses, showed greater than average interest in the subjects and the skills his students learned.

Women's model relations and instructional norms

Among women teachers, discussion of teaching, among other topics, was appropriate in and out of school. Most women talked about teaching with individuals inside and outside of school. Outside of school, they talked about it with their husbands, close friends and relatives. Unlike most men, most women did not associate with each other outside the school day. The apparent in-school sources of women's common instructional norms were across-department networks, and dyadic relationships within and across departments. If they were married, women generally went home to their families.

During the lunch hour, women occupied a large table in the center of the lounge, and discussed a broad range of topics.

> About everything. We'll talk about kids at lunch, or if somebody had a bad day, or you know, some kid was terrible, or your class was really great, or everybody passed your test for a change. Those kinds of things are talked about at lunch.

Even among the women, large group discussion of content or skills was rare. More commonly, women would share information about problem students. One woman observed that there was a network of women who provided in-school counseling, support and encouragement for other women in their attempts to meet the social and emotional needs of students.

> You know ... this group of women is kind of a quiet thing. It's not a forceful, it's not "I'm the boss" ... It's kind of a quiet, I don't even want to say 'movement', that's too strong of a word. A feeling. It's really nice to get together at lunch and say, "Hey, look, I have this kid," ... "What do you think? What should I do?" You know, and they'll all kind of work together, if they know a kid's having a problem. "Oh, I have him in this class. I'll see what I can do."

In general, women seemed more committed to teaching than did men at Pinehill. All of three of the women whom we observed and interviewed at length expressed levels of commitment which exceeded that

of the majority of the other teachers at Pinehill and the majority at Cherry Glen. Women averaged twice as much time outside school on teaching work as men, including the man with the extra 15-20 hours a week. Being single seemed to boost outside time commitment for both schools. However, both of the married women significantly more or their non-school time on school work than any of the married males.

Many women shared a vocational orientation toward their teaching engagement. Some women shared a perception that teaching was suited to their personal identity. Others expressed a missionary zeal to meet the emotional and social needs of their most alienated students. One of the females who had contemplated leaving high school teaching described her increasing attraction to teaching at the college level.

> I've never been able to see that I could do anything else that I would enjoy as much as I do teaching. I've just never been able to see it. Now, maybe if I found something that I thought I would enjoy, if I could get into a field where I was involved in writing, preparing textbooks, giving lectures, assisting education in some way, that perhaps I could go for.... It is not just a job. Teaching is not just a job. It is a way of life. It is an attitude. It is part of our national growth. So it, it isn't just a job.

Women were more likely than men to value and engage themselves in some form of content and skills instruction. Also, women teachers were more likely to express and become engaged with eclectic instructional goals: a content or skills acquisition orientation combined with "caring," or socialization for adulthood goals (like those men listed above). One woman teacher linked the improvement of a student's self-esteem to student establishment of good work habits; and the teacher connected good habits with academic learning.

> Kind of take somebody under your wing, and make certain that they turn things in, and make them feel like they are important and that it matters that they get their work turned in, and just make them, some of the kids don't have much of a self-image, and I guess to help improve that self-image.

> The doing homework and the learning to be punctual and learning to take responsibility, and turn things in. That kind of thing that goes right along with ...the subject matter.... [I] don't want to say it's more important, but I think it's just as important as knowing something about [the subject].

In general, women's instructional goals differed from men's in two respects. First, among women, goals were more likely to be eclectic combinations than men's more consistent focus on adult socialization of stu-

dents. Secondly, women tended to include content and skills instruction as an important element of their goals.

Especially among women, dyads provided an outlet for those who wanted to discuss curriculum issues or trade techniques. None of the males we observed all day mentioned similar dyadic relations. One of the two women most concerned with content and skills also drew support from association at a local university. Both who were most concerned about content relied on dyads rather than the lounge group for sustenance in school. Both thought they had the principal's support for their goals.

Both men and women teachers seemed to feel that the public did not appreciate their work. For women, this fact seemed less important than the intrinsic rewards of engaged teaching. Among women, there was little of the calculative cost-benefit analysis common to men's discussions of staying in teaching.

> I basically, like, I do enjoy teaching. I would not say to you, well I wish I could be doing something else or something.... This is not an easy job. This is a very difficult job. It's a very time consuming job. It's a very draining job. You have to give. When you are in front of a classroom, you have to really work to try to get them to all pay attention and do things and you have to keep being enthused and it's very, very tiring. It's also very, very enjoyable. Otherwise, we wouldn't be doing it, but I don't know. I guess that's it. They [the public] think we have it easy. It may appear easy, like a kid will say, "you get paid for this. This is so easy." Oh, boy, if they only knew!

Summary: Integration at Pinehill High School

School-wide norms of general acceptance, along with Mr. Taylor's efforts to build informal and personal relations between himself and teachers provided teachers with a basis for sociability and broad acceptance within the school. Not only the principal, but also the teachers contributed to social integration on the school level through social event(s) and through the acceptance of idiosyncrasy and the twin minimal prescriptions. However, these norms, unlike those at Cherry Glen, contributed little to the development of task-based staff relations.

Differences between the genders shaped patterns of relationships and communication rules, influenced the extent and nature of engagement in teaching, and effected the primacy of educational goals and practices. Women's norms and relations reinforced a vocational engagement with teaching. Women held teaching goals that emphasized both perceived student needs and other educational goals, including academic content/skills acquisition. Men's norms and relations minimized commitment to the teaching role,

supported a continuance perspective and minimized or denied the value of content or skills teaching. Men's norms and relations influenced most males to concentrate almost exclusively on the inculcation of values men thought would be useful to students after graduation, such as obedience, and work completion. Finally, the most engaged men and women teachers at this school, especially those most involved in content/skills instruction, were most isolated from most of their peers.

Work Control At Pinehill High School

Control of Instruction

Compared to Cherry Glen teachers, teachers at Pinehill enjoyed considerably more autonomy over their classroom work. Unrestrained by effective collegial or administrative pressures to adhere to a department curriculum, teachers at Pinehill felt free to adopt curricula-in-use and methods which suited their dispositions. Little in the way of formal policies, departmental prerogatives, inadequate resources, internal or external pressures stood in the way of teachers' classroom control. The toleration of idiosyncrasy, and the administrative tendency to personalized management contributed to maximizing individual teacher control over the curriculum in use. Some content and skills-oriented teachers used this autonomy to develop inventive classroom approaches to content or skills teaching or both. Other teachers used the autonomy to fend off unwanted pressures from peers, parents or administrators.

Unlike Cherry Glen teachers, men and women at Pinehill High School were not required to participate in time-consuming extracurricular activities or student supervision (beyond standing in hallways between classes). Unlike Cherry Glen teachers, Pinehill teachers were not required to submit formal explanations of grading policies. Unlike the Cherry Glen curriculum control process, the Pinehill curriculum-in-use was what individual teachers decided it would be.

> We spent all the last year and a half laying out this [subject] curriculum and what everybody is going to teach, and it's all typed out. So teachers got paid during the summer to do this. [When] day one starts, you do what you want to do. That's it. You do what you want to do. It's set on paper, ok? ... I don't know if that [the written curriculum] really represents what's being done in the classroom.

Three of the male teachers said that they could be teaching a completely different subject for a long time before anyone would notice.

> You know, if I wanted to teach anything, you know, if I had a concept ...that didn't fit, I could teach anything I wanted. Basically, and as long as you don't send people to the office, as long as we control our classrooms, as long as we don't have parents on our back, rocking the boat, we do what we want.

Many of the taken-for-granted influences on teachers ultimate classroom instructional control operating at Cherry Glen operated at Pinehill, however. Administratively determined ability grouping of students, assignment of teacher to particular classes, and state certification requirements were examples of such influences.

Like the Cherry Glen teachers, most Pinehill teachers believed that little the administration or other teachers did interfered with their ability to control instruction. However, most Pinehill teachers, like their counterparts at Cherry Glen, preferred stable groupings of students. Most felt that with such groups they could anticipate what kinds of activities and materials would work best with particular classes. They therefore sensed no constraint in administratively determined ability grouping. Many Pinehill required subjects at Pinehill were more ability-differentiated than similar courses at Cherry Glen. As at Cherry Glen, most Pinehill teachers felt that the allocation of students and teachers to specific classes was based on rational, fair and complex guidelines. Pinehill teachers were not asked to participate in the discussion of school policies, but few could identify any school policies that affected their teaching. Like Cherry Glen, most teachers felt that the administration would protect them against parent interventions unless teachers violated the twin proscriptions.

The main source of external control on instruction at Pinehill was the highly sorted nature of the student body, a pattern that had been more marked in the past. The sorting of students into higher and lower abilities affected teachers' assessments of what they could do or were willing to do in the classroom. Most teachers stated ways in which they could successfully plan and teach classes composed of either upper or lower ability sorted students. Five teachers said that they had found activities that they thought worked well with high ability groups and other activities that worked better with low ability groups. In general, the activities for low ability groups were limited to basic skills and inculcation of values like deference to

authority, promptness and "listening skills." In upper ability groups, teachers' activities were designed to promote content acquisition, synthetic and analytic thinking and writing skills, and coping with complex issues. Two teachers developed instructional models that fit their upper ability classes then applied diminished versions to their lower-ability classes.

> I don't know if watered down is the right word. More explanation would be a better word than watered down. I spend more time, make it simpler, use simpler language, you know, trying to get down to their level. Now that some people say bring them up to your level rather than go down to theirs, but ...if they can hardly talk or write, how are they going to come up to my level, hmm? Just can't do it. So with the better classes, I will use a higher level presentation. Higher level vocabulary, whereas when I get down to these kids, they can't understand that. So then I have to water down the way I talk to them.

Most Cherry Glen teachers found their upper ability level classes easy to control. At Pinehill, most teachers preferred teaching the upper ability-sorted groups, though five of the eight teachers we observed and interviewed at length commented that upper-ability groups could be difficult to control.

> T: I don't know if I could stand five hours of honors.
> I: Because?
> T: They're nice because their assignments are done, and that kind of thing, but sometimes they can be trying.... They're a little more vocal you get ones like the ones you saw in there that, you know, act up.

Two of the five teachers were ambivalent about the extra preparation required to teach upper ability classes. One teacher pointed out how difficult it was for him to find adequate materials to match their interests and skills:

> [I] have to reach back and find exercises and activities that will help the kids cause they're so, they're so ...high to start with. If, if you're talking, if your, if your question is "what do I find most difficult to achieve my goals?".... I would say it would be the high level classes. I'm not accustomed to having them.

Only one of the teachers with higher ability students felt that she could control the rewards she expected from teaching this level with certainty. She had personally designed many activities that made upper ability students participate in class, use writing and thinking skills and learn the course content.

At least six out of the eight teachers who had or were presently working with lower ability students had found methods they regarded as successful. Teachers spoke of setting standards which lower-ability students could reach, if students made reasonable efforts. For example, one teacher commented that students felt joy in learning how to write a paragraph. This pattern extended to other teachers, most of

whom thought that they could plan activities that would make students learn something , and that something they considered worthwhile.

Most teachers, especially the men, preferred high and low sorted student classes to average or un-sorted classes.

> [A teacher talks about difficulty in teaching heterogeneous average classes] So who do you talk to? You talk to kids on the bottom, and the kids on the top sit there and say, "Oh, my god, look at this". You talk to the kids on the top and the kids on the bottom sit there, they don't know what you're talking about. Those are the hardest classes to relate to ...because of the wide range of intellect in the classroom. Whereas that third and eighth hour class, they're all in the ninetieth percentile. I know who I'm talking to there.

Control of rewards-gender differences

The ability or willingness of teachers to reach students was gender-related. Many men found intrinsic rewards in teaching harder to acquire than did women, especially in their average and lower ability classes. Most of the women were able to find rewards in most of the classes they taught, though all three found it difficult to reach many individual students in their lowest ability classes. It seems not all of the difficulty that teachers experienced in reaching students lay in the characteristics of the students. It seems likely much lay in the perceptions of the teachers, because the difficulty differed according to the teachers' gender.

Four men teachers we observed and interviewed at length claimed that a large percentage (thirty to forty percent) of their average and lower-ability students were overly passive, disinterested in, or resistant or hostile to classroom learning. These men said they preferred highly verbal to silent students, yet often their conduct of lessons seemed to elicit passive participation from students.

Many of the men we interviewed seemed to believe that student passivity was due to factors beyond their control. One teacher attributed the passivity of thirty to forty percent of his students to society's devaluation of education; this devaluation, he concluded, was evident in student attitudes toward teacher-directed classroom instruction.

> I would be explaining something to them up in front of the class, and she would be turning around talking to her friend about her date last night, and when I'd say, "Ok, uh, Susie, pay attention", she'd turn around and in, in effect, say, "Don't bother me with your ...education bit. I'm more interested about what happened last night". And that's the attitude.

According to another male, passivity was partly due to students' being unable or unwilling or both.

> ...the slower classes, they can't talk. Or they don't want to talk, or they don't know what to talk about. So sometimes they just sit there, and oh my god, hurry up, clock. And I'm thinking the same thing, let's get out of there and get it over with.

He described teaching these students as like talking to a "wall." By contrast, he felt that higher ability classes contained natural participators:

> Yep. Those are the kids who are not only intellectually smarter, those are all the kids who are on the basketball team, and of course, you were in here yesterday, those are all the cheerleaders, the pom-pon girls, the debaters, the forensic kids. They're involved in school.

Another male teacher guessed that student passivity might be due to the lack of blue collar parent interest in their education.

Three of the five men teachers we observed all day controlled potential failures and disruptive behaviors of average and below average students through negotiation. Negotiation consisted of contracting with students by offering them few work requirements and getting non-disruptive classroom behavior and regular completion of required assignments in return. Students fulfilling their part of the bargain would pass, and those who did not might fail unless they were bright enough to do well on tests. Four of the five males observed all day made classroom participation including tardiness or attendance or both, work sheets and other written assignments major components of their grades. Practices like this de-emphasized the importance of student test and quiz grades, and therefore the importance of subject and skills instruction. One teacher told us he announced to a class of lower ability sorted students the first day of the semester:

> ...you do these work sheets, you pay attention to me in class, everybody in here gets a "C". A few of you, I'm going to give a "B" to, because we've got some projects coming up" [he went on to say that students who did not do these things would get F's, and that students who participated in the blood drive would get B's; he did not say if there was any way students could get A's].

Women teachers did not discuss any ways in which they negotiated grades for compliance. In most of the three women's classes regardless of ability, many activities required active student participation. Teachers pressed students harder and allowed less student off-task time. Two of the three women teachers we observed and interviewed at length said that only their lowest ability classes had large numbers of

passive and difficult to motivate students. Nonetheless, most women felt that students' presentation of apparent passivity and disinterest required extra teacher effort to reach students. They did not see a need for teacher resignation or negotiation on teachers' parts.

> So, a year or so ago, I would have been ready to give up the [lower ability] class, but there are times when, as with this group, they're a challenge, because I want to see how many of them can succeed, and that becomes a challenge, and when they get something, they're so overjoyed that it becomes a real thrill to teach them, because they begin to feel very positive. And it is a place, it takes a different kind of a preparation and classroom activity. The others, you have to, you have to, for the other high classes, it's, it's the intellectual challenge with the material, and getting them to try to do their best. With these people, it's trying to find a way to tap their interests, so that they can open themselves up to learning, which is a whole different thing. So that's kind of interesting.

Teachers at Pinehill responded to lower and average ability students in gender-specific ways. These ways reflected teachers' subjective perspectives on the inherent capabilities of students. Some saw these as lying within, and some saw them as lying outside, their instructional control. Men were more likely to assign fixed characteristics to average and below average classes. Once having assigned unteachable labels to classes of students, such teachers rejected the possibility that they could reach these students. Women teachers, while recognizing apparent student passivity in their lowest ability classes, were more likely to regard passivity as a symptom or a changeable condition, not a situation beyond their control. These women were able to find some ways in which they could reach at least some of these students. Administrative allocation of students was only one part of work control. Gender groups influenced the very manner in which teachers defined students' abilities and desire to learn, and so consequently influenced their belief in their own ability to reach students.

Social Integration, Work Control and Engagement at Pinehill: Differentiated Engagement

Engagement at Pinehill varied widely, much more widely than at Cherry Glen. Normative and social relations promoted differential teaching engagement. Instead of supporting professional engagement, sub-groups supported either vocational or continuance kinds of engagement. Some teachers used the large amount of autonomy to develop highly creative learning experiences for students, while others used the same autonomy to limit engagement to little more than what the administration required.

The administration and colleague groups at Pinehill High School exerted few formal pressures on teachers' classroom work. Most teachers found teaching materials and time adequate. Teachers found the allocation of upper and lower ability classes fair. The administration infrequently supervised teachers, and did not require that teachers follow departmental curricula. There were no regular faculty meetings, and few other teacher meetings, and few formal reporting requirements. In the place of formal and authoritative policies and chains of policy delegation, the administration relied on personal contacts between the principal and individual teachers and on department chairs as two-way transmitters of information and commands.

Norms of camaraderie, toleration of idiosyncrasy, and the twin proscriptions gave a general sense of belonging that was loosely related to the tasks of teaching. At Pinehill High School, teachers could be members of the staff by adhering to minimal common norms and rules. Teachers could be accepted if they did not violate the twin proscriptions, threaten to ruin camaraderie, or impose their teaching goals on others.

Gender groups integrated teachers in more powerful ways, either strengthening or weakening commitment to types of teaching engagement through gender-relevant norms, social networks and instructional control practices. Men's group norms and relationships colonized the school's social and physical spaces, socializing men into non-school-related activities. Women's group norms and relations integrated women into school-related and school-relevant activities. Subject/skills-engaged teachers found themselves on the margins of both the school gender groups, though a woman on the margin could find single confidants with whom to share mutual teaching interests. Many men interpreted student resources differently than women did. Most men felt that they had little control over learning outcomes with average and below-average classes. Women, while regarding their lowest ability classes as difficult to engage, mostly felt that they could make small gains with extraordinary exertions.

Gender group membership was strongly correlated with the level of engagement in teaching. Among the men, lower levels of involvement, time and emotional investment and effort were common. By contrast, women committed themselves to much more time outside the school day in lesson preparation and correction of student work. Time commitments arose out of gender norms. Male norms reinforced the

belief that teaching was a job that occurred between specific hours, and was not to be brought into the rest of one's life. Female norms reinforced the belief that teaching was a vocation involving a commitment to extra preparation outside of the classroom and the school.

CONTRASTING INFLUENCES ON THE LEVELS AND KINDS OF ENGAGEMENT AND SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR REFORM

The findings of this paper do not support reform proposals that would call for using universal increases in either work control or social integration as levers to increase teachers' engagement in all schools. The findings do support reforms which take into account the complexities of actual school relationships, the complexity of engagement and the complex, interactive nature of school integration and work control.

Teaching engagement is itself complex. It includes involvement, commitment and absorption in both goal orientations and career orientations. Individual teachers can be committed to one or more goals, and one or more career orientations. Within particular schools, teaching career orientations may be either fairly homogeneous or differentiated.

Normative and social integration interact with each other. School leadership, social networks and linkages are the sources of norms, but expectations about school participation, classroom instruction and other matters can define the boundaries of groups and influence in or out of school interaction or both. For example, in Cherry Glen, teachers most frequently associated with and identified with other department members; department members shared common ideas of teaching and participation with each other. In Pinehill, outside of classroom men most often associated with other men; men most often discussed non-teaching subjects and shared common expectations that teaching consists of transmission of values and socialization of students for adult occupations. Norms affected group formation and groups affected norms.

Schools can be integrated in different ways, since normative and social integration interact. If normative integration centers on subject/skills, task-involvement, and curriculum, as at Cherry Glen, enhanced social integration may lead to greater teacher engagement in the teaching of subjects/skills. If normative integration is focused on sharing interests unrelated to work or distancing teachers from work,

as it was at Pinehill, increased social integration may lead to continuance orientations and a lack of engagement in the teaching task. At both schools, there was variance in orientation, but Pinehill seemed to sponsor greater variety in teaching orientations and teaching goals. It may not be how much employees are socially integrated but the kind of normative integration that operates in the school that establishes both a level of engagement and a type of engagement.

Control arrangements in the two schools reported here seem to have particular benefits but also costs. In a school like Cherry Glen, where administratively-backed departmental curriculum control was dominant, teachers may have felt more certain of their task, but less constrained to innovate. In a school like Pinehill, where individual teachers could control what they taught, teachers may not have felt as certain of their impact on students, but better able to experiment. However, simply allowing teachers autonomy and not interfering in their classroom work may leave teachers most interested in content/skills isolated, having to develop outside supports.

If greater integration or greater work control are used as levers to affect teacher engagement, it is important to address the interactive effects of any changes. The kind of work control allowed teachers at each school seemed to correspond closely with the kind of integrative environment which prevailed at the school. Thus, changing the kind or level of integration is likely to produce both changes in work control and engagement. Changing the kind of work control may affect integration.

In summary, what can we learn about these two schools that we could apply to the enhancement of teacher engagement? Particular integrative environments are associated with particular kinds of work control and particular kinds or combinations of engagements. Integration and work control interactively affect the level and types of teacher engagement in schools. Asking what structures or combinations of structures, in what combinations affect what kinds of engagement in schools in differing kinds of communities suggests the need both for thought about what kinds of teaching/learning we value most and a challenge to our ability to think in situationally-relevant and complex terms.

SOURCES

Aiken, Michael, and Hage, Jerald. 1966. "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis." American Sociological Review. 31:497-507.

Barr, Rebecca and Dreeben, Robert. 1983. How Schools Work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Becker, Howard S. 1960. "Notes on the Concept of Commitment." American Journal of Sociology. 66:32-40.

Bidwell, Charles E. 1965. "The School as a Formal Organization." Pp. 972-1022 in Handbook of Organizations, edited by James March. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Blauner, Robert. 1964. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boyer, Ernest. 1983. High school. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Connell, Robert. 1985. Teachers' Work. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Corcoran, Thomas B. 1985. "Effective Secondary Schools." Pp. 71-97 in Reaching for Excellence: An Effective School Sourcebook, edited by Regina Kyle. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Corwin, Ronald G. 1981. Patterns of Organizational Control and Militancy: Theoretical Continuities in the Idea of "Loose Coupling." Pp. 261-291 in Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, Vol. 2, edited by Ronald Corwin. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

Cusick, Philip A. 1983. The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School. New York: Longman.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. 1984. Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching. Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation.

Dreeben, Robert. 1973. "The School as a Workplace." Pp. 450-473 in Second Handbook of Research in Teaching, edited by R. M. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Dreeben, Robert. 1970. The Nature of Teaching. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., Inc.

Erickson, Kai. 1986. "On Work and Alienation." American Sociological Review. 51 (February):1-8.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1975. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press.

Finley, Merilee. 1984. "Teachers and Tracking in A Comprehensive High School." Sociology of Education. 57:233-243.

Firestone, William A. 1985. "The Study of Loose Coupling: Problems, Progress and Prospects." Pp. 3-30 in Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, Vol. 5, edited by Allan C. Kerckhoff. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

Freedman, Sara, Jackson, J. and Boles, K. 1983. "Teaching: an 'imperiled profession.'" Pp. 261-299 in The Handbook of Teaching and Policy, edited by Barry Sykes & Lee Schulman. New York: Longman.

Fuller, Bruce and Izu, Jo Ann. 1986. "Explaining School Cohesion: What Shapes the Organizational Beliefs of Teachers." American Journal of Education. August 501-535.

Gamoran, Adam and Dreeben, Robert. 1986. "Coupling and Control in Educational Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly. 31:612-632.

Hammersley, Martyn. 1984. "Staffroom News." Pp. 203-214 in Classrooms and Staffrooms, edited by Andy Hargreaves and Peter Woods. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Hargreaves, Andy. 1984. "Contrastive Rhetoric and Extremist Talk." Pp. 215-231 in Classrooms and Staffrooms, edited by Andy Hargreaves and Peter Woods. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Hargreaves, David H. 1967. Social Relations in a Secondary School. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hemmings, Annette. 1988. "Real Teaching: How High School Teachers Negotiate National, Community, and Student Pressures When They Define Their Work." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA: April.

Kottkamp, Robert B., Provenzo, Eugene E. Jr., and Cohn, Marilyn M. 1986. "Stability and Change in a Profession: Two Decades of Teacher Attitudes, 1964-1984." Phi Delta Kappan. April:559-567.

Lacey, Colin. 1977. The Socialization of Teachers. Bungay, Suffolk: Chaucer.

Little, Judith W. 1982. "Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of Schooling," American Educational Research Journal. 19(3):325-340.

Lortie, Dan C. 1986. "Teacher Status in Dade County: A Case of Structural Strain?" Phi Delta Kappan. April:568-575.

Lortie, Dan C. 1975. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lortie, Dan C. 1973. "Observations on Teaching as Work." Pp. 474-497 in Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, edited by R.M. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally.

McPherson, Gertrude. Small Town Teacher. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass., 1972.

Metz, Mary. 1978. Classrooms and Corridors. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Metz, Mary. 1986. Different By Design. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Metz, Mary. 1988. "'The American High School': A Universal Drama Amid Disparate Experience." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April.

Meyer, John and Rowan, Brian. 1977. "Institutionalized organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." American Journal of Sociology. 83:340-362.

Moeller, Gerald H. and Charters, W.W. 1966. "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers." Administrative Science Quarterly. 10(4):444-465.

Nias, Jennifer. 1981. "'Commitment' and Motivation in Primary School Teachers." Educational Review. 33(3):181-190.

Powell, Arthur , Farrar, Eleanor and Cohen, David 1985 The Shopping Mall High School Boston Houghton Mifflin Co

Rosenholtz, Susan 1985 "Effective Schools Interpreting the Evidence " American Journal of Education 93(3) 352-388

Seeman, Melvin 1975 "Alienation Studies " Pp 91-123 in Annual Review of Sociology, vol I, edited by Alex Inkeles, and James Coleman Palo Alto, CA Annual Reviews, Inc

Seeman, Melvin 1972 "Alienation and Engagement " Pp 467-527 in The Human Meaning of Social Change, edited by Philip E Converse and Angus Campbell New York Russell Sage Foundation

Shanker, Albert 1985 "The Revolution That's Overdue " Phi Delta Kappan January 311-315

Sizer, Theodore R 1985 Horace's Compromise Boston Houghton Mifflin Co

Sykes, Gary 1984 "The conference " A paper presented to the California Roundtable on Educational Opportunity's Symposium on the Teaching Profession Asilomar, California

Thompson, James D 1967 Organizations in Action New York McGraw-Hill Book Company

Tye, Barbara B 1985 Multiple Realities A Study of 13 American High Schools Lanham, Maryland University Press of America

Webb, Rodman and Ashton, Patricia 1986 Making A Difference New York Longman

Weick, Karl 1983 (1976) "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems " Pp 15-37 in The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education, edited by J Baldridge and T Deal Berkeley, California McCutchan Publishing Corporation

Weinshank, Annette , Trumbull, E and Daly, P 1983 "The role of the teacher in school change " Pp 300-314 in The Handbook of Teaching and Policy, edited by Gary Sykes and Lee Schulman New York Longman

Woods, Peter 1983 Sociology and the School London, England Routledge and Kegan Paul plc

Woods, Peter 1984 "Staffroom Humour " Pp 190-202 in Classrooms and Staffrooms, edited by Andy Hargreaves and Peter Woods Milton Keynes Open University Press

Zielinski, Arlene E and Hoy, Wayne K 1983 "Isolation and Alienation in Elementary Schools Educational Administration Quarterly 19(2) 27-45